

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

A Magazine of Theory and Practice

Vol. 19

December 1945

No. 4

EDITORIAL

The contributors to this issue have valiantly proclaimed the necessity of continued vigilance to maintain the liberty of the press in a free world. A year ago when the theme for this number of THE JOURNAL was first contemplated, a poll of the National Opinion Research Center had revealed the startling—and shocking—fact that thirty per cent of the adults of this country did not believe that newspapers, even in peacetime, should criticize our form of government. In other words, one out of every three citizens of this free country does not support (or does not understand) a fundamental guarantee of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution.

The role of education in maintaining civil liberties is nowhere better stated than in the wide variation of opinion on the question among persons with different amounts of schooling. While only one out of eight college graduates and one out of four high-school graduates would deny the rights so stoutly defended by Andrew Hamilton two centuries ago, opinion was equally divided among those with less than a high-school education.

Day by day, the subject of the free press is discussed in the pages of our newspapers more frequently than any other concept of democracy. Any public speaker who can drag in a ringing phrase in defense of that freedom is virtually certain that he will be ade-

Copyright 1945 by The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc.

quately reported no matter what world-shaking events compete with his remarks for precious space. And he has an excellent chance of becoming the subject of an editorial.

Yet the press alone can never reach all of the people. Atom bomb stories have been given far more space since the Atomic Era dawned four months ago than even the defense of press freedom. For a while it looked as if the world-wide problems created by the big explosion were to be solved by some kind of journalistic filibuster. Still, a hundred days after Hiroshima, a sober, serious youth in the uniform of the United States Army, complete with overseas ribbons and battle stars, was overheard maintaining emphatically that "there is no such thing as an atom bomb—it's all a lot of propaganda!" No opinion poll figures are handy on the extent of that belief.

Freedom to read and freedom to print may always need their defenders, but, alone, they do not seem to be enough. Perhaps there should be a case made for the *desire* to read and the *desire* to print.

HAYDEN WELLER

THE VOICE OF AMERICA ABROAD

William Benton

The "voice of America" is a voice with ten thousand tongues. It is all that the people of other lands hear about us and all that they read about us. It is the American motion pictures they see and the American GI's and tourists they meet.

I am glad we Americans speak with ten thousand voices. Some critics would call it a confusion of voices. But it is the democratic way of peoples speaking to peoples. The alternative way—the "single voice"—is the way of censorship and of ministries of propaganda.

My theme is that the people of the United States, through their government and their State Department, have a vital national interest in the voice of America. Their national security may be at stake if this voice is inadequate or distorted—if it fails to represent us with reasonable fullness and fairness as we really are, our history and our culture, our faults and our fears, our hopes and our ambitions for our democratic processes and our free society.

Today thirty-eight short-wave radio transmitters, operating all over the world under the direction of our Government, are known to millions in Asia, Africa, and Europe by the name, "The Voice of America." Here is an example of the new role of government. The Voice of America radio programs supplement and help to clarify the message of America's ten thousand tongues. Further, they reach vast areas of the world which otherwise would be completely shut off from America.

There are people in Iceland, China, Iran, the Argentine, and the Balkans—millions of ordinary people all over the world who listen eagerly for America's voice. During the war these Voice of America broadcasts went out over the air every day in the year in forty languages. Today, in the backwash of the war, they go out in eighteen languages. They give people in foreign lands straight,

impartial news from America, news in their own languages, news untainted by special pleading or by propaganda.

The radio Voice of America was developed in war by the Government. Now before the American people and the Congress is the broad and inclusive question: "What role shall the Government play in America's voice abroad in peacetime?"

Is it enough, in the rapidly contracting world of today, for our people and our Government to be presented to the peoples of the world as a giant, completely equipped with battleships, superfortresses, and atomic bombs, but voiceless except for diplomatic exchanges and the erratic interplay of private communication?

There is one basis for judging the future information policy of the government abroad upon which we can all agree.

Does an expanded peacetime role for government help us to achieve national security? Is it worth while deliberately to explain ourselves to the rest of the world? Does this help give us willing and friendly allies in times of crises as well as in peace? Is understanding also a force? Is it not the kind of force we prefer? Suppose we had to choose between two investments in security—between a year's cost of the radio Voice of America and its rough equivalent, a year's cost of operating one battleship in a fleet of battleships.

These are new questions for America. They will be debated in the next few weeks and over the years to come. Battleships are the traditional symbols of our security. But to speak to the other peoples of the world about America—to speak through such new and miraculous channels as short-wave radio—to seek security through understanding rather than through force—that is a new role for our Government.

In the field of short-wave radio beamed abroad, we have not yet decided how best to operate, manage, or control; we only know that the Government must put up most of the money to underwrite the cost if a job is to be done.

The American people have deliberately chosen a policy of active

participation in world affairs. As a people we are becoming aware of the danger inherent in that policy. We do not propose to forsake the policy, but we must realize that the danger is greater if America is misunderstood abroad. The next few years—perhaps the next few months—will be crucial. The new United Nations Organization will be meeting its first tests. America will be trying to revive world trade on a sound basis. The time to build the kind of peace we want is now, and in the years just ahead.

Yet the plain fact is that as we enter this crucial period America is neither fairly nor fully understood by the peoples of other nations.

America is a legendary country to most of the world. It has been a land of legend through most of its history. The legend has changed from time to time. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, America was the land of freedom; in the nineteenth century, during the great waves of immigration, it was also the land of opportunity.

The American legend today is a curious and contradictory mixture. A legend can hardly be otherwise.

We are known to be immensely strong. Yet Axis propagandists found ready belief for the story that good living had made us so weak and spineless we would not and could not fight.

We are acclaimed generous and openhanded with billions to spend on lend-lease and rehabilitation—a veritable Uncle Santa Claus. At the same time we are called Uncle Shylock.

We believe in freedom of speech for all, yet sinister capitalists are said to control the means of communication.

We stand for free enterprise but our critics abroad stress our great combines and monopolies.

The Metropolitan Opera House is the goal of all foreign opera stars but we are said to have no music except swing.

We believe in due process of law, yet the world pictures the gangsters shooting it out on the streets of Chicago.

Now I am not going to suggest that any role that the Government

can play abroad will clarify this picture readily or quickly. Like education, of which it is a part, information is a slow laborious business that works no miracles and produces no millenium of understanding. It can, however, help to correct mistaken ideas. It can make available the facts about our actions and our policies as they develop out of our customs, our laws, our institutions, and our politics.

A government information service abroad to strengthen America's voice should, in major cities, include a room or three or four rooms, or a building where the ordinary people of Amsterdam, Cairo, or Chungking—for example—can go to find out about the United States. During the war we developed small United States libraries in many foreign cities. They were used by newspaper writers, schoolteachers, doctors, farmers, engineers, students, and people off the street. There is intense curiosity abroad about the United States. I am thinking of the long lines of anxious people who came to our American library of information in Melbourne on the day of President Roosevelt's death. They wanted to know what would happen to our Government. Would we have an immediate election? Who would succeed the president, how, and why? Their concern was real and immediate. I am thinking of the foreign youngster who stopped in at an American picture exhibit to ask why the boundaries of our States are so straight. I have in mind a doctor who stops in at the American library in Montevideo to search American medical journals for news of the latest treatment of infantile paralysis. It is a remarkable fact that the British Government's stationery office has printed and sold more copies of many American war documents than has our own Government Printing Office. An example is *Target-Germany*—the official report of the operations of our Eighth Air Force. British bookshops sold several hundred thousand copies of this report.

A few weeks ago the veteran scholar and world traveler, Henry Seidel Canby, returned from Australia and New Zealand. He re-

ported that our libraries there—I quote—“Have enabled the right people at the right time to learn for themselves, from books and not from propaganda, what America was, is, had, could offer, what we were thinking, and how we felt. They and all such institutions should be part of our permanent foreign policy.”

Far more important than the rooms, of course, are the books, periodicals, and documents they house. Few of you can have any conception of what these mean, for example, to the liberated people whose only link with us for the past five years has been the radio Voice of America. Let me read a few lines from a letter that came to me from Athens just the other day. My correspondent, Mr. Nicholas Chantiles, is a stranger to me. This is what he said: “I knew there was a whole treasure behind those library doors. Books and magazines full of that unrivaled American democratic spirit, books where the authors are free to express their ideas and beliefs, whatever they may be.” I confess I was moved by that letter.

In wartime we have discovered, too, the immense value of official American political documents to the newspapers, the scholars, and opinion makers of other countries—documents that the commercial news services do not cable in full and which, therefore, will be sent abroad only by the Government. Foreign editors ask for the complete texts of Presidential speeches, Acts of Congress, reports such as General Marshall’s on which to base their editorial comments and special articles.

Our Government documentary films have won appreciative audiences abroad. Just the other night I saw a small documentary, that has gone overseas, about the jeep. It showed how American ingenuity produced for war a vehicle that has captured the fancy of the world. It was a simple but entertaining film. Millions of people in other lands have been instructed by it. It was a piece of information about Americans.

Finally, I should like to tell you briefly what a United States information program should be in terms of people. The bone and

marrow of any good program are, of course, the people who run it. There is no substitute for face-to-face relationships. We only need a few hundred Government information people abroad, directed on policy by our Ambassadors, and available to foreign editors, broadcasters, and others. They should be real Americans in the sense that they know America. Having homesteaded in Montana as a boy, I am personally partial to those who have deep roots and varied experience in rural and western and southern America. With such knowledge of America, they can represent America more faithfully in foreign lands.

Perhaps even more important people over the long pull are those we systematically exchange with other countries—the students, professors, technicians, scientists, and others. Here in the United States, such visitors see us as we are and take that story home. They become our friends and remain our friends. Those American students and experts we send abroad to foreign universities and governments go as representatives of our traditions and culture.

These are some of the materials available to the State Department in its efforts to represent the American people in the development of America's voice overseas. Such efforts need not compete with our private businesses operating abroad. They should only supplement and facilitate normal, commercial, and private communications. They should operate chiefly in those areas where private agencies will not or cannot function profitably. Nor should we conduct vague, well-meaning, good-will campaigns. Our information program should be modest, realistic, and candid. America's voice should be neither the big stick nor the supersalesman. The Government's role will represent only a fraction of the great volume of communication between ourselves and our friends abroad—a fraction, but a highly important and indispensable fraction.

Ultimately, there are only two roads to national security. One is sheer physical power, the other is mutual understanding with

the other countries of the world. We now need to follow both roads. But we must hope that we shall need to invest less of our resources in military power, as we invest more of our thought and attention in the task of mutual understanding.

In an atomic age—understanding, not bombs, is the last, best hope of earth.

The Honorable William Benton is Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Public Affairs. He is charged with momentous responsibility in the development of free dissemination of information in the postwar world.

THE RIGHT TO PRINT—KEYSTONE OF FREEDOM

Kent Cooper

It is now that military victory has been achieved that the world faces its grave moral and spiritual crisis. Whether human freedom, which we have fought to defend at such appalling cost, will have been won or lost will depend upon how we meet this crisis.

The most powerful forces for evil in history have been vanquished or destroyed, but the spirit of conquest, the urge to dominate and enslave, is not dead. Nor is there any assurance, on the basis of protective measures thus far taken, that powerful peoples will not be thrown once more into the hysteria of conquest.

It is a reality that another war will see atomic bombs, propelled by rocket power to great centers of population, from hidden bases far away, across great oceans. I do not propose to enter the controversy regarding how the "secret" of the atomic bomb should be handled. At most, that is a temporary problem. The successful bottling up of knowledge of such moment for any considerable time is impossible.

Yes, the allied powers have committed themselves to the formation of a world organization designed to guarantee the peace. But this is no time to delude ourselves that lofty objectives are gained with fine phrases. The complexities of the postwar negotiations are truly appalling, and I have no wish to minimize the efforts of our own statesmen or those of our allies. The fact remains, however, that, basically and realistically, we have been setting up only a military alliance of great powers. It is no more than that, and there is no comfort whatever to be taken from that historically unsuccessful formula for peace.

We have certainly emerged from this war the greatest military power on earth. But we are only about six per cent of the world's population. Do we dare hope that there are enough of us, and that we will have the patience and pertinacity, to police the world?

We must recognize that this war came as a climax to centuries of struggle for a way of life, for a civilization, based on the freedom and dignity of the individual. But this struggle, through the Renaissance and Reformation, and the democratic revolutions of the eighteenth century, centered in western Europe and the western hemisphere. Its success was limited in scope to a minority of the earth's peoples. Even to this day, the great majority of the peoples on this planet have had no experience with the individualism that is basic to our western civilization.

A particularly menacing aspect of this is that the experience of the past few generations shows that peoples whose traditions are intrinsically authoritarian can adopt the mechanical and physical processes of western civilization with extraordinary success, without adopting or even understanding the basic philosophy or individual freedom that made the achievements of western civilization possible.

In the more recent phases of the development of our civilization, considerably after the democratic revolutions of the eighteenth century, came a new revolution, which is still sweeping forward to ends that we cannot foresee. I refer to the revolution of applied science, usually called the industrial revolution. It is perhaps now on the verge of its most revolutionary achievement, the harnessing of atomic energy. But the important thing to remember is that without the individual freedom which we had won such a vast releasing of human creativeness and ingenuity would have been impossible. It required the free collaboration of free minds over a long span.

We know only too well how Japan, just emerging from feudalism, was able to industrialize itself in three generations, and how it almost succeeded in setting up a vast authoritarian empire over the far reaches of the western Pacific and eastern Asia. Germany, under the ruthless Nazi dictatorship, achieved phenomenal industrial strength, and would certainly have conquered all of Europe

and more had she not been opposed by the men and machines of America.

There is great danger in the fact that the industrial revolution has made twentieth-century society fantastically complex, interrelated, and interdependent. Men become incredibly specialized in their endeavors. Each becomes a tiny cog or pinion in a highly complicated machine. What does this mean in terms of protecting individual freedom?

The Germans and the Japanese got astonishing results by keeping each human cog and pinion in place and functioning by police power. We know that over a period of time such slave states would decay with the stifling of human creativeness and ingenuity. But the short-term success, in terms of productiveness and power, are as alarming and amazing.

There is an extremely grave hazard in this for the maintenance and development of individual freedom in our very western lands in which it developed, yes, here in our own America. In the complicated productive and distributive organism of any modern nation, serious disturbance to the function of any vital part, such as transportation or fuel production, can bring chaos. When people are cold and hungry, whatever their traditions of individual freedom, they want action. If a strong man, a would-be dictator, can convince them that he alone can bring order out of chaos, what chance is there that they will wait for democratic processes to function? Indeed, this is a grave hazard in many countries now striving to re-establish their economies.

So now, even though a war has been won, we find ourselves in a world in which the tradition of individual liberty for which we have fought has not penetrated very far; in which the mass-production techniques which we have developed may be adopted and made to function with temporary but extraordinary success by totalitarian methods; in which many peoples are hungry, cold, ill, and impatient with basic principles; in which the only formula

developed to bring world order is a military alliance of a few great powers.

In this connection, it is important to note that our most powerful ally, Russia, is a great nation which has emerged suddenly into the industrial era without time to cast off the authoritarian traditions of centuries of Czarist rule. It is important that the Russians are actively discussing "freedom," and we may hope that their definitions of it may eventually coincide more closely with ours. But we cannot and must not fail to note that their freedom is still freedom such as it is within a one-party and intrinsically authoritarian rule.

II

It is imperative, in this great crisis in the march of civilization, that we determine what it is that has been the keystone to liberties. The foregoing may seem gloomy and pessimistic, but, if the problem is faced realistically, then we may have high hopes that the current crisis may lead to the kind of world for which we have fought at such great cost.

It is important to remember that our civilization began to develop almost simultaneously with the invention of the printing press five centuries ago. We know that truth is reached only through the free association of ideas and information. Progress is possible only through the free collaboration of free minds. This process cannot thrive under totalitarian or absolutist forms. We know what is today's truth may be tomorrow's absurdity. We know what tremendous progress has been made in our western civilization in comparison, for instance, with Asia, where hundreds of millions have subsisted on the bare edge of starvation for centuries.

Now what is the basic essential to this free collaboration of human minds? The answer is so simple that we rarely think of it. Obviously, it is the *printed word*. The spoken word is important. But before the radio, it could reach only a limited audience. And

even with the radio, the spoken word is quickly forgotten, or it is remembered imperfectly, or it is distorted in the retelling. The printed word is the day to day and year to year record. It may be read, reread, and pondered. Through the printed word, man may judge what has succeeded and what has failed. It is essential to progress.

So the struggle for freedom goes hand in hand with the struggle for the right to print. No sooner was the printing press invented, than despotic kings and rulers sought to license it and control it to make the printed word an instrument for the ruling of men, rather than for their freedom. The right to print was finally won in much of western Europe and in America, but on this continent it flowered as nowhere else. The soil was ripe for new freedoms.

Indeed, I devoutly believe that our well-being has been made possible by the charter of our liberties that was included in the first amendment to our Constitution: religious freedom, freedom of speech, the right of people to assemble freely and seek redress of grievances, and lastly, the guarantee of them all—freedom of the press.

Because of my convictions that freedom of the press, for example, can do a very great deal if it is a part of the organic law of every nation, I have rather insistently demanded its acceptance throughout the world. Yet before I discuss the international aspects of the question, I am going to point to certain trends and refer to certain developments in the government's extension of its powers here at home as respects certain important industries.

Recognizing these trends, I refer to them prayerfully. This I do because I want my government to be right. In what it is doing, I hope it is right because it is doing it whether or not I think it is right, and it apparently is going to keep on doing it. So I recognize and bow to its power. Moreover, I extend to it confidence in its good intentions, even though I see equities destroyed and even though, try as I may, I cannot be sure but that a very great deal of unwar-

ranted and withering government interference is being applied in these strange adventures.

There has been a short-circuiting operation between the executive and judicial branches of the government that has eliminated Congress, the legislative branch. As a result, new philosophies have been imposed upon certain businesses of this country resulting in fundamental changes within the past decade, all at the hands of the two government branches. The manifestations of this transition are many and varied. I shall refer only to those evidences of transition that pertain to what has been defined by one high in the government as opinion forming industries, specifically, the radio and the press.

Cases involving the press and the radio have recently been before the Supreme Court of the United States, first begun by the Federal Government to bring about government control through injunction and regulation. In the radio case, broad principles regarding the regulation of the business practices of the broadcasting industry were presented to the Court in pursuit of the government's determination that regulations promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission shall control the industry.

Although no attempt had ever been made by the Commission to assert such powers throughout the history of radio broadcasting, and despite the fact it is obvious that such powers in the hands of the administration are of fundamental and far-reaching importance, nevertheless, the majority opinion in the broadcasting case in the Supreme Court upheld the full power of the Commission not, mind you, based on any expressed grant by Congress, but solely on the basis of judicial implication of such a grant of power to the Commission.

So the broadcasting industry may fear that the government, headed by the successful candidate of a political party, may be legally empowered to do much of what it pleases respecting radio. The question is, what will it please to do? And radio being

licensed and regulated by government, how obdurate would it dare to be against government dictation?

That the government action against radio assumes the outline of what is familiarly called in government circles today a "pattern" is further evidenced in the recent antitrust case of the United States against the Associated Press. Here again is a question of far-reaching importance as to government control of the business affairs, this time of a news agency that serves the public through the press and radio. The news agency in its turn is defined as an opinion-forming industry and is placed under control by Federal judges through the medium of injunction demanded by a former president of the United States as executive head of the government through his attorney general.

Now this control is imposed despite the fact that the court found that for nearly a century the Associated Press had been conducting its affairs honestly and uprightly with no compulsion to do otherwise except its own sound, moral reasoning. The Court found that through all this time it had presented an impartial news report, free from the control of political thinking of any individual or group. Solely because of its record of accomplishment therefore, the Court convicted the Associated Press of superiority and told it that it must abandon one of the bases of its success.

Now all of this was in spite of the fact that the majority of the court expressly found that the Associated Press did not have a monopoly either in the gathering of news or in the sources of the news. But with these expressed findings, the majority opinion held that as there might be a tendency at some unspecified time for such a monopoly to occur, the admission of members to the Associated Press must no longer be left as a matter solely within the control of the Associated Press but that hereafter (the news service now excelling) this right must be exercised under the supervision of the Federal courts.

Now I gladly say, as I have said as respects radio, no attempt so

far has been made by the government through the courts or by the courts to assert editorial powers over the news the Associated Press delivers in spite of its successful legal intervention in its affairs. In explanation of its efforts to make the Associated Press service available to any one who wants it, the government distinctly disavowed its intention to gain control of the news report. Nevertheless, it is obvious, as in the case of radio, that the powers now in the hands of the administration are of fundamental and far-reaching importance and that they are definitely not based on any expressed grant by Congress.

So we have freedom of speech in the homes of the land through the medium of radio definitely channeled for regulation by a government commission appointed by the President who is head of a political party. Also, we have control of an instrument of the press in the manner outlined.

Legislative authority assumed by the judiciary did not have to reach deeply into the workings of the radio industry since that industry is specifically licensed by the Government itself for the operation of its wave lengths. Without government license, it cannot exist.

But the arm of legislative usurpation by the judiciary had to reach deeply indeed to anchor its judicial control of an instrument of the press, for the press is not licensed by the government.

It would perhaps be well, therefore, for American citizens to take full note of all of these executive-judicial government activities that deal in what we might call food for the mind. In doing so, in so far as this presentation of mine is concerned, I make it clear that even if I were disposed to question the desirability of this trend toward governmental control in these matters, with all of its potentialities of arbitrarily imposed power, I am not doing so. That is for you to do if you choose. It is for you to ascertain whether the policy is to continue to be applied and, if so, how far it is to go.

Being jealous of press freedom at home and hopeful of its exten-

sion throughout the world, I make yet another reference to a curious omission respecting it which has never been explained.

You remember that the first amendment to our Constitution refers to freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of the right of the people peaceably to assemble to seek redress of grievances. Also, you will recall a former president presented a revised list: freedom from fear; freedom from want; freedom of religion; and freedom of speech. Mention of the press was omitted, while freedom of speech was included. Thus, the statement stressed the new mode of reaching the public mind through the voice of broadcasting, an industry either regulated or owned by all governments. All nations, however, do not control the press, mention of which was omitted. I ask why freedom of the press was omitted when the cry for its extension is being heard around the world?

So far as America is concerned, I do not believe that the first amendment to the Constitution should be considered outmoded. Lest it is on its way to oblivion, I undertake to remind you that the words of that immortal document have not been changed.

III

Before the First World War, America lived securely between its two oceans without much concern about the rest of the world. We fought that war, we thought, to make the world safe for democracy and to end wars, but our government made no investigation regarding how the warring nations had been driven to fight each other.

As a newspaperman, I did so during the last war and found that the aggressor countries controlled the press and perverted truth in news. That plainly was one of the chief causes. As an individual, I brought my findings to the attention of the peacemakers at Versailles, but I was told that press freedom would not be in the

peace treaty because all matters affecting news had been settled privately.

And so they were. Barriers against freedom of news exchange and a free press were erected in a Europe trying to recover from the devastations of war. Without question the processes then set up to control news exchange contributed largely in bringing about the second war. Realization of this fact moved me, at the beginning of this war, to expose what happened after the last war and to try to gain assurance that with the end of this war the old formula would not be restored.

Once more now, we find the peacemakers struggling over spheres of influence, territory, and reparations. But this time no government, especially our own, is ignorant of what press freedom can afford in the maintenance of peace. Knowledge of the modest efforts to make press freedom world wide that were begun here has been extended to every land. Anybody can read discussions of it, if he lives in a country where the press is free.

In our own country it is something everybody is for. Yet why have new terms of vague application, such as freedom of information, been substituted for press freedom? Why is it not realized that information which cannot be published in the land where it originated is not going to help the cause of world peace? Why do we take the role of snoopers? Why not establish in all countries the right to know?

Here we secured declarations in the political party platforms and through Congress, by a concurrent resolution, but all of them averted a forthright use of the term "freedom of the press." Nevertheless, in whatever modified form the resolutions went through those bodies, the result was the placing of the matter squarely on the doorstep of the President of the United States. And there it is.

That being true, I wish that every American citizen could share my fervor that the President may thoroughly understand that press freedom everywhere is essential for the future welfare of

mankind. Expressed with due humility, I wish my voice could carry conviction that every one should watch developments or the lack of them from the White House in this matter of applying the guarantee that truth shall be available to all men, since the truth makes men free.

From another source we have had cause to congratulate ourselves for what has happened to one of our enemies. We have seen that a great general at the head of our armed forces on the other side of the globe has demonstrated his ability as a statesman. A free press, "the right to know," has been forced upon the vanquished Japanese. They do not know, as yet, how much this means to them, but time will tell them that with a free press guaranteed them, the war their dictators inflicted upon them has gained them one great boon. For his action I promptly saluted this warrior statesman with a message which read in part:

Your full and direct acceptance of the principle of imposing freedom of the press upon the vanquished Japanese will forever glorify you in the minds of Americans whom I have been trying to convince for nearly thirty years that world-wide press freedom is essential to world peace.

That message went to General Douglas MacArthur, who replied in part:

Deeply appreciative your inspiring message. It is propitious moment to present able clear and convincing picture of this great issue of freedom of the press and its relation to world peace. Your audience will listen now. Again my thanks.

Yet we have a great deal farther to go. Suppose I lift the curtain a little on an outline that I acted upon long before General MacArthur put his decree into effect. It was in these terms:

1. Require that the vanquished nations guarantee their peoples a free press as we know it in the United States.
2. Require that any nation which requests help in re-establishing itself economically will guarantee its people a free press as we know it.

3. Leave to the press itself the missionary work to bring the same result in all other countries.

4. Announce the determination of the United States to foster and bring about news-transmission facilities with a nominal rate that will guarantee the free flow of news between all the capitals of the world.

To those points I added the statement that I just could not believe that today the greatest opportunity of all time may be missed; that the public should know whether or not this one guarantee of future peace will be imposed in any country in return for the money and patronage of our people, freely bestowed; that freedom of the press is the best means by which daily judgment can be made as to the degree of adherence by any nation to a policy of peace; that our people are entitled to know what our government is going to do; that I understand and am appalled at the complications of negotiations involving the victorious nations; that nevertheless, I feel, first, as respects the peace treaties with the aggressors, the victorious nations would impose press freedom if America demands it; that second, as respects the nations that seek our help for rehabilitation, no other victorious nation would be involved in our own gifts; that we are at the crisis in this matter of requiring press freedom to guarantee maintenance of the peace; that science having made all men neighbors through the means of communication and travel and also having found elements to destroy the entire human race, this country, in order to develop friendships instead of hatreds, and to bring peace instead of war, should insist upon world press freedom unless it wants its children to perish.

What we must seek is a world at peace. Henceforth, only in a peaceful world can the human race survive. I firmly believe that a world free press can develop into the world's antidote for the employment of the atomic bomb.

Kent Cooper, Executive Director of the Associated Press, has been the outstanding exponent of a free press for a free world for the past three decades.

FREEDOM TO READ, SEE, AND HEAR

Morris L. Ernst

Most of us make a major mistake in our thinking about freedom of speech and of the press. We think of it as meaning only freedom for the writer or speaker to carry on without interference (as from government). But under the conditions of today, something else is needed too—freedom for the rest of us to read and to hear; and that includes, if it is to be effective, chances to get information and ideas from a number of sources.

The basic assumption underlying our Constitutional guarantee of a free press is that, if the market place of thought is kept open and free from artificial restraint, the truth will ultimately win out. But it is of little use to give writers and speakers unrestrained access to that market place if they cannot sell their wares because one man owns the only stall at which sales can be made. Or, to change the figure of speech, it does little good to permit everybody to speak his mind if one man has sole access to the only amplifier that will enable others to hear him. In that case, the speakers may be free but the auditors are not. Only if they may hear a diversity of views have they that opportunity for choice that is the essence of freedom.

This is not a new concept of freedom of speech. It has been expressed again and again. But too few of us have grasped its importance for us today. And a great many of us must grasp it firmly if a few powerful agencies of mass communication are to be prevented from monopolizing the American public's access to news and ideas.

Whether the handfuls of people who already dominate our present chief media of mass communication are good or bad is quite beside the point, for our salvation rests not upon the virtue of those who dispense news and ideas to us, but upon our being offered enough *varieties* of news and ideas—enough varieties of

wrongheadedness, if you will—to be able to select what we deem to be true. Nobody, however public-spirited, is good enough to impose unanimity of thought upon America.

Consider the present situation. We have a diversity of book-publishing houses in America—though there is an acute danger that when the cheap book business booms after the war, as it pretty surely will, two or three colossi of mass-production publishing may arise to get a stranglehold on that business. We have a diversity of magazines—though in these days when circulations mount into the millions the dire possibility of concentrated control must never be lost sight of. But it is not in these media that the problem is most critical, but rather in the three media which have the most immediate and overwhelming mass influence: the newspapers, the radio, and the motion pictures.

Newspapers. Since 1910 the number of newspapers in the United States has fallen sharply. The percentage of American towns in which there is only one newspaper has doubled. By 1939, there were 1,450 towns with daily papers, and in 80 per cent of these towns there was only one paper left. Although there are now more newspaper readers than ever before in our national history, less than one per cent of all our daily papers control roughly a quarter of the circulation pie, and just 19 Sunday papers command almost half the total Sunday circulation. It is quite true that the newspaper chains—Hearst, Scripps, and so forth—no longer cast a widening shadow; but we must remember that the disintegration of a chain after it has reached its maximum point of efficiency will not restore to life the papers that it killed in its destructive climb to power. In 1939, in West Virginia, one man owned two thirds of the papers independently¹ published. What kind of market place is that for the survival of the truth? At what point do we believe that one man's owning the mind of a State is a threat to its liberty?

Radio. Four networks dominate the American air. Two thirds of

¹ We have considered two papers owned by one publisher in the same town as one paper.

all radio stations are affiliated with one or more of the networks, because they have found such an affiliation a practical necessity for profitable operation: approximately 40 per cent of an affiliated station's income is from the national networks.

Nor is that all. Because of the shortage of network productions, there are only a handful of national advertisers who can afford to buy radio time. In 1943, less than 150 advertisers gave the networks 97 per cent of their business. And in reality the concentration is greater than even that figure would indicate. Both NBC and the Blue Network receive about 60 per cent of their business from only 10 advertisers; and one eighth of NBC's total advertising volume in 1943 came from just one advertiser!

One other fact about the situation in radio: newspaper publishers have long been buying radio stations; indeed, about a third of the approximately 900 radio stations in operation are affected by newspaper domination; and in over 120 areas, the only newspaper in town owns the only radio station. What chance, in those areas, for real diversity of sources of news areas, for real diversity of sources of news and ideas?

Motion Pictures. Five major companies—Paramount, Loew's (MGM), Twentieth Century Fox, Warner's, and RKO—dominate the screen. They and their three satellites produce about 70 per cent of all features made in this country. They are interested in distribution too: the five major companies alone, in the five years preceding 1941, collectively released about 80 per cent of all features, and their three satellites released another 15 per cent. Finally, they play a major part in exhibition. In this latter field their three satellites do not venture. The five major companies alone control enough theaters to take in 70 per cent of the total motion-picture box-office receipts of the nation.

The three-ply solidity of the major companies' position as producers, distributors, and exhibitors has enabled them to enforce many discriminatory trade practices at the expense of their inde-

pendent rivals—block booking, blind selling, percentage deals, advanced admission prices, etc. As the TNEC's monograph on the industry pointed out, "Thus integration in the motion-picture industry is complete, from the inception of an idea for a picture through to the actual exhibition of the film. The importance . . . of integration . . . lies in . . . virtual elimination of competition. The result is to deprive movie audiences of any effective freedom of choice except among the pictures funneled to them through this narrow channel."

We may be sure that in the years to come things will not remain just as they are. Either the chief media of public information will fall into the hands of progressively fewer and fewer people, or we shall make at least a start toward restoring to the American people the right of diversity. Now—before the process of consolidation goes any farther—is the time for us to make up our minds which trend we prefer. Over this issue may be waged one of the fiercest battles of the next decade.

How could the right of diversity be restored? A number of methods have been suggested, and some of them are already being pressed.

1. Long ago this nation adopted the principle that railroads might not own coal mines, railroads might not own steamship lines, banks might not own security affiliates, bank directors might not also be brokers, etc. This principle is being extended to the motion-picture field through the Government's efforts to divorce producers from theater ownership and to break up the exhibiting circuits. In the newspaper field, similarly, limitations might be imposed upon chain papers; for example, there might be a limit to the number of newspapers that any one interest could own within a State. In the radio field, the Federal Communications Commission has long questioned the advisability of permitting newspaper owners to own radio stations. It might be wise to divorce network ownership from station ownership.

2. The Government might refuse to permit contracts that create servitudes in the agencies of information—as, for example, it now opposes block booking, tie-in franchises, and exclusive first-run franchises in the motion-picture field. What about contracts that provide weekly newspapers with a block booking of boiler-plate material with advertising, for example? All three media might be examined with a view to action which would prevent a marketer of thought using his copyright to restrict the market unless he is willing to sell to all comers at a reasonable price. (This is, in effect, the Brandeis position of thirty years ago in the AP case.)

3. In other respects our laws, especially our tax laws, might be revised so as to offer fewer inducements to concentration and more advantages to new and smaller entities. Does the income-tax deductibility of advertising, to the extent that it is now allowed, help big units unduly? Should the taxation of newspaper chains (or of radio stations, or of magazines) follow such a principle as has been followed by some States in their antichain-store taxes—imposing a franchise tax which increases with each additional unit?

I am not, here and now, arguing on behalf of any of these suggested methods of restoring diversity. Each of them raises special problems that would involve us in numerous side issues. There may be better ways of achieving the necessary end. What I am arguing for is a focusing of the public mind upon the danger that confronts us, and a close study of any and all methods of meeting it.

One more point. The forces in opposition to my thesis are the very forces that can swing the mind of America against finding any remedies for the situation. I can almost hear their arguments now. Anybody who declares that the situation must be met by government action—who says that the Government has not discharged its full responsibility for freedom of speech by refraining from restricting freedom of thought, but that it must also prevent monopoly of the market place of thought, by encouraging a wider

and freer market—will be accused of wanting the Government, itself, to enter into the business of dispensing information (as, for example, by what has been prettily called a “TVA of the air”). Let me say now, therefore, that I for one would be appalled at any such government action as this. The chance would be altogether too great that if the Government went into the information business itself, it would in time dominate the whole area and shut off all criticism. We would have jumped from the frying pan into the fire.

I can hear critics of my thesis saying, too, that I am charging the present dispensers of information with being low and destructive fellows. Let me repeat once more, therefore, that I am doing no such thing. I am accusing them of nothing more than doing business so effectively under governmental privileges and sanctions that they occupy more of the field than it is safe for us to let any one occupy. This is not a matter of personalities, but of principle; and the only safe principle upon which a free America can keep its freedom is that of the free and open market in ideas.

Morris L. Ernst is the author of *The Best Is Yet*, a recent autobiography. He is a well-known New York lawyer, has specialized in libel and civil-liberties issues, and is the author of the forthcoming book, *The First Freedom*.

A FREE PRESS IN A CITIZEN'S ARMY

Egbert White

The problems of a free press in the military services is vividly revealed in the following article by Colonel White who was frequently a center of controversy during hostilities because of his views on the latitude that could be permitted a soldier paper.

There is so much confusion in the minds of most people about *Yank* and the various editions of *Stars and Stripes* that I think it worth while in the interest of clarity to begin by explaining the status and character of each of them.

Yank is a weekly magazine, published under the direct control of the War Department. Its basic editorial content is prepared in New York and syndicated to each of its editions. The local editors are allowed to use four pages, occasionally more, for local material.

Stars and Stripes is a group of daily newspaper chains. There were originally two such chains. The first was published in London, Ireland, and later in France and Germany. The second was started in North Africa immediately after the invasion in November 1942. Later, other editions of the *Stars and Stripes* were started in Cairo and at several points in the Pacific. Each edition, whether a single paper like Cairo, or a chain of six papers like North Africa, is under the control of the Commanding General of the Theater of Operations. Each of these is entirely separate in staff, management, and policy. The only thing they have in common is their name. This, of course, has lead to much confusion about who is printing what.

I was the Officer in Charge of the *Stars and Stripes Mediterranean* from its first issue in Algiers on December 9, 1942, until July 7, 1944. Hereafter, when I refer to *Stars and Stripes*, I mean the *Mediterranean* editions.

The first issue of *Stars and Stripes Mediterranean* was four pages, tabloid size, and printed weekly. Within a few months, there were daily editions in Casablanca, Oran, Algiers, Tunis, Palermo, and

Naples. Rome was captured on June 5, 1944, and the first edition there was printed on the same day. Later, editions were established in Leghorn and those in North Africa folded up as the areas were evacuated by the American troops. If I may be permitted a little boasting, I would like to say that I think *Stars and Stripes Mediterranean* was the finest army newspaper ever published and that its staff would compare favorably with any home newspaper. Quantitatively, it provided its readers with the most newsmatter of any army newspaper. For a long time now, it has printed in Italy an eight-page paper daily and twenty-four to twenty-eight pages on Sunday. Carrying no advertising, it is equivalent in news content to a sixteen and forty-eight page paper here.

The first edition in Algiers was printed in the plant of the local French newspaper. At first, we borrowed from their meager supplies of paper and ink.

The problem of supply always plagued us in those early days; but one way or another, we always got a little newsprint in time for every issue. We always were facing an emergency, but we never failed to bring the paper out on time. Once, when we were completely out of newsprint, a British convoy which had been destined for Malta put in to Algiers and unloaded. In its cargo was some newsprint for a Malta paper; the British loaned it to us.

Zinc for cuts always was short as was ink. Once I flew to Cairo, two thousand miles, and bought nine sheets of zinc at forty-five dollars a sheet, as well as five barrels of ink, and some other supplies. I got back to Algiers with the ink just in time to go to press.

The linotypes were old and no repair parts were available. Our boys kept them operating by a miracle of ingenuity. They repaired them with baling wire, paper clips, and other brilliant improvisations.

Distribution was always a problem. Our first consideration was the distribution to combat troops. At first we tried to ship by air to Constantine and then to have the paper distributed to the front

through army channels. This did not work very well. Bad weather and operational priorities seemed to delay the paper every week.

We begged the Army for transportation and were told we could have all we could buy. The Germans and Italian Armistice Commission had requisitioned every car they could. When our army arrived, it requisitioned hundreds of cars willingly brought out of hiding by their French owners.

We heard of two missionaries who had a tiny eight-horsepower Renault but who had so far successfully resisted every one's efforts to requisition it. We persuaded them to let us have it.

With the Renault, we established a man at Constantine who got the papers at the airport and distributed them to major headquarters through the combat zone in eastern Algeria and Tunisia. Soon we were using several men, and they had trucks and jeeps instead of a tiny passenger car. From the major headquarters of corps or divisions, the Special Service Officer distributed the paper to smaller units. This method got the paper to practically every soldier in the combat zone, but we were never satisfied because deliveries were often delayed two or three days.

Later in Italy, we worked out a distribution system that involved sending the papers by truck from the printing point to main distribution points from which they were delivered down to regiments by our own men with their own transportation. For the Anzio beachhead, papers left every night by boat from Naples accompanied by a *Stars and Stripes* circulation man. At the beachhead, a man stationed there permanently with a truck delivered the papers to the troops. They had their papers only one day late. Everywhere else in Allied Italy, the paper was available the same day it was printed.

However, the character of a newspaper depends on its staff. I have not the time to tell you of the scores of fine men who contributed in major ways to the paper. At the risk of doing many of the boys an injustice, I will mention some of the leading figures. First,

Robert Neville, who as a sergeant, wrote the first edition almost singlehanded, and who now, as a Lieutenant Colonel, is its Officer in Charge.

Then, there is Major Christenson who, as the administrative officer and business manager, has done a magnificent job.

The first printer we uncovered was Private Irving Levinson, a graduate of the Carnegie Institute of Technology School of Printing and a thoroughly experienced craftsman, who turned out to have an uncanny knack of getting on with the French workmen. He knew no French, yet he could communicate with the French workmen by means of a weird system of sign language, pidgin English, and a rapidly acquired Brooklyn French, plus a marvelous personality and a great capacity for leadership.

Levinson—who soon became a master sergeant—supervised the establishment of eleven editions, acted as first sergeant for the outfit, and was always a “spark plug” in the organization.

Our first editorial man after Sergeant Neville was Private (then master sergeant and now mister) Milton Lehman. He served successfully on the desk as managing editor for a time. Then he got the urge to do field reporting and gave us no respite until we consented to let him try his hand at front-line reporting. From then on, his by-line appeared in practically every issue of the paper until his recent discharge; now you are seeing it in *The Saturday Evening Post*. He covered the Anzio beachhead from D day until the breakout. At one time, when it looked as though the Germans might drive our assault force back into the ocean and various non-combatants were being evacuated, he was told that he had better get out while the going was good. “I’ll stay,” said he, “and write as long as the rest of the boys stay and fight.”

Then in rapid succession, other able men joined us: Jack Foisie, who won the Legion of Merit for his daring and brilliant coverage of the Sicily campaign and whom Ernie Pyle eulogized with Bill Mauldin, the cartoonist; Dave Golding; Ralph Martin; John

Willig; and brilliant, hard-working Al Kohn who, like Lehman, begged to be relieved of his desk job and given a reporting job at the front where he was killed in September 1944 by German machine-gun bullets. Gregor Duncan was a young artist of great talent whose illustrations and maps did much to brighten the paper. He was killed by shellfire in the push to Rome.

But what of news? It is only news that makes a good newspaper. What kind of news did we want, what could we get, and how did we get it?

War news of our own Theater was written by our own reporters. War news from other Theaters came from the basic-news file of the Office of War Information. Equally important, perhaps more so to our readers, was the news of home. That was always a heart-ache, and the problem of getting enough of it—and getting it promptly—was not solved to the satisfaction of the staff until after the election in 1944. Some came from the OWI basic file, but the OWI naturally selected its news for its interest to foreigners. Its use by *Stars and Stripes* was a by-product. Sports news came in fair quantity from the Army News Service. In the spring of 1943, we sent one of our own reporters to the United States to act as *Stars and Stripes'* foreign correspondent in reverse. Later, we maintained two men in the States. They each did a tour of about four months and then were replaced by others. This ensured our having some material selected by men who knew the Theater and knew what our readers wanted, but it still was not enough. By the fall of 1943, we had enough money so that we could afford to pay for regular news service from the Associated Press, the United Press, or International New Service, and also to pay for its transmission by commercial radio which by that time was available. However the War Department refused approval for such an arrangement.

As the election approached, we were more and more concerned about providing our readers with a fair and impartial, but full, report of the campaign. The Army News Service files on politics were slow, inadequate, and timid. Our two men in the States

could not hope to do an adequate job even if they had devoted all of their time to it. Again we asked the War Department for permission to buy a straight Associated Press and United Press news service; again permission was refused.

With all the elaborate machinery which the Information and Education Division, Army Service Forces, has established for orientation and education, it dismally has failed to meet the real and simple basic needs of the Army, and it blocked the contribution we might have made in our Theater through a better news service. Along this line, I would quote a brief extract from a dispatch by Gladwin Hill writing from the European Theater in *The New York Times* of September 1, 1945:

The key men in the indoctrination units, the information and education officers, have been so busy organizing and selling courses in Shakespeare and poultry raising that they had no time to put across just what we are trying to do in Germany. With all the Army's extensive machinery for indoctrination, this correspondent has not found a soldier who could recall having received any elucidation, stimulation or encouragement about his present chores.

Features were an important part of the paper. In every edition, there was a columnist who covered GI "society," entertainment, and personalities. These columns were uniformly popular. Mauldin's cartoons were beloved everywhere by the GI, and "L'il Abner" often beat the front page for first readership. Generals and privates alike grabbed the paper eagerly to read the latest news from Dogpatch.

It is always a surprise to civilians that soldiers write and read poetry avidly. The poetry printed in *Stars and Stripes* was one of its most read features. It was all contributed by readers, and, on the average, about three hundred poems a week reached the editor of "Pup Tent Poets." Some of it was good; much was bad. Sometimes even the bad poetry was good because it reflected so perfectly the GI point of view about some typical experience or emotion.

Another important feature was the letters column. It was the

one place where a soldier could express himself freely and publicly about the weather, the mud, the Arabs, his girl, his officers, the slowness of the mail, the strikers at home, the MP's, or what not. Often something was done about a gripe which was justified. In one city where *Stars and Stripes* was published, a letter about dirty beer cans at the local PX was printed. This brought a reply which said, "The Commanding General has investigated this complaint and finds it justified. The condition will be corrected."

The perennial friction between combat troops and base-section troops was the subject of an occasional needling. By getting it out into the open, the sense of frustration, which the combat troops felt at not being able to do anything about something they considered an injustice, was relieved. Frequently, the publicity helped to correct situations so as to improve the morale of our fighting troops.

An example of this occurred last summer. A letter was published containing bitter complaints about the conditions at the 7th Replacement Depot. The letter stimulated an immediate inspection of the camp by "high brass." The Commanding General was relieved, and in a front-page story the new Commanding General was quoted to the effect that KP would cease for GI's sweating out their return home, that the PX would be open twelve instead of six hours, that guard duty details would be reduced, that tours of scenic and historic places would be available every day, and that mail service would be improved. The *Stars and Stripes* said, "the golden age for reple-depple soldiers is upon us."

Under both General Eisenhower and General Devers, the paper was given a free hand in handling soldier mail, and no soldier was ever disciplined or threatened with discipline because of anything he wrote to the paper. Bill Mauldin's cartoons lampooning base-section MP's brought us great applause from the troops and some hard feeling from base-section generals.

The paper never pulled its punch in printing bad news—if the news was bad. If the soldiers at the front suffered a reverse or won

a hard-fought point, they did not want to read about it in sugar-coated, cover-up terms. If they had to fight through mud and cold and enemy fire to gain a few yards of bloody ground, they did not want to read that, "Yesterday, our troops surged forward in a sweeping advance of irresistible power." They did not surge, or dash, or roar forward or run pell-mell over the enemy. All the time, in both Italy and Tunisia, it was a hard-fought, foot-by-foot battle against a tough and skillful enemy, and always against terrain which defies description; and we wrote it that way.

Stars and Stripes' eye-witness accounts of the fighting often were filed by the civilian correspondents and were widely printed in the United States. One of the most widely quoted stories was a piece written in April 1944 which described the Anzio beachhead as a flop, and pointed out the disappointment of the command and the troops at the failure of this brilliantly begun operation to pay off as it had been hoped it would. This story was based on material released by the Chief of Staff and was available to all correspondents. However, many of the correspondents chose to quote the *Stars and Stripes* as authority for the story, and I have been asked frequently by newspaper people in the United States, "How did you get away with printing a story like that?"

There was never any censorship applied to the paper in the Theater, except the most essential military censorship. Our relationship with the military censors was usually friendly and close.

The paper, of course, served many useful command purposes. Information about new equipment, new orders, schools, bond purchases, and remittances home, all reached the soldiers faster in the *Stars and Stripes* than in any other way. The paper carried much material about the prevention of disease, particularly malaria. How much to campaign against venereal disease was a frequently debated subject. We never satisfied the medics, but neither did we ever have the bible belt on our necks.

When the *Gripsholm*, loaded with sick and wounded being re-

patriated from Germany, touched at Algiers, its first stop in Allied territory, in the summer of 1944, the first thing the Red Cross girls gave the men when they went abroad was a copy of a special edition of the *Stars and Stripes*. It was a sixteen-page review of the news of the past year. The men were so starved for news that, in spite of hundreds of American girls aboard with candy, cigarettes, and good American talk, an almost breathless silence descended over the ship for forty-five minutes while the paper was read for the inestimable boon of news—honest, dependable, and with a true American flavor—war, sports, strikes, politics, and what have you.

The desire for reading matter is an urgent and desperate need among our troops abroad, particularly among combat troops. The Information and Education Division, charged with the responsibility of getting reading matter to the Army, did not work out a good distribution system until the end of the war. Distribution slows up progressively as the distance from the base areas increases. In spite of the millions of books and magazines which were shipped abroad, there was never, where I had personal observation, anything like good distribution to the fighting fronts. Particularly, there was a desire for current American periodicals. Practically speaking, very few *current* periodicals other than *Stars and Stripes* actually reached the fighting troops in the Mediterranean Theater.

Printing facilities in Africa and in Naples were very limited. Consequently, it was impossible to secure the press capacity to print additional publications. However, the presses used were of a type that could print a sixteen-page tabloid in approximately the same press time as the eight pages which were standard for the *Stars and Stripes*' daily editions.

We therefore hit on the idea of printing eight-page supplements which would contain material from American magazines. Distribution could be effected with the *Stars and Stripes* with no additional requirements for personnel or transportation, and the

material could be put into the hands of readers on the same day that it was reaching readers in the United States.

The supplements were extremely popular among all ranks of the Army. In fox holes at the front, on transport planes, on trains, in hospitals, everywhere that soldiers had time to read, you would see the roughly folded magazines come out of pockets and musette bags.

This supplement service, however, was discontinued in July 1944 on orders from the War Department which advised that it was contrary to Army policy. The supplements were greatly missed by the troops.

A *Stars and Stripes* service which was extremely popular was the home subscription. For two dollars a year, a soldier could have the paper sent to his home in the United States. With no promotion, this subscription list built up to nearly fifty thousand copies.

The paper gave to the families of soldiers at home a familiarity with the conditions under which the men were fighting, which far exceeded anything most soldiers could write. The mention of hundreds of soldiers by name and home town in each issue was an important factor in morale; and the references to units helped to promote *esprit de corps* both in the Theater and at home.

To the disappointment of thousands of soldiers and their families, the Theater was ordered by the War Department in July 1944 to discontinue the acceptance of these subscriptions.

I am frequently asked whether we had trouble with the Army, whether we had too much interference, and whether there was too much effort to make the paper into a propaganda sheet. We had very little such trouble from our officers in the Theater, and we had wonderful backing from General "Ike" from the very start. However, we had plenty of trouble from the Information and Education Division in Washington.

My first contact with the Division was when, as a civilian, I was

asked to organize a committee to make plans for an army paper. The plans were approved, and I was asked to accept a commission and to head the paper. That was *Yank*. My troubles began with the first issue. It happened that the increase in pay of privates from twenty-one dollars to fifty dollars was announced as our first issue was coming out. Naturally, the staff considered it the hot news and played it on the cover. The Director of the Division came in during the morning, ordered the presses stopped and the front page changed because he said it made it appear that the American Army was more interested in money than in what the war was about.

In the third issue of *Yank*, we had a story about the personal-combat training which the infantry was getting at Fort Benning. In this course, the men were taught commando tactics: how to kick the enemy in the groin, how to strangle a sentry from behind, how to gouge out eyes in hand-to-hand fighting, etc. We got a Jap, put him in a Jap uniform, got a graduate of the Benning course, took them up to Central Park, and made a series of pictures. We felt it was good editorial material for two reasons. First, it was news about the actual training the men were getting; second, it was the kind of conditioning to this war that men who had been reared in an atmosphere of pacifism needed to have if they were to face their jobs with realism.

For that, I was called down to Washington and lectured for printing stuff that was unsporting and contrary to American ideals.

Then there was Walter Bernstein's cute story on dining at the White House. He, a sergeant and *Yank* correspondent in Washington, had been invited to lunch by Mrs. Roosevelt. He wrote a pleasant and amusing little piece describing his emotions, what they had to eat, and what they talked about. That was the straw that broke the camel's back for the Director called me down to Washington, said that I apparently did not understand even so simple a military fact as that the President's wife was to be treated respectfully, that he no longer had confidence in my editorial judgment,

and therefore that I was relieved of editorial authority as of that moment.

Then I was sent to Alaska to organize coverage and distribution there, and in September of 1942 I was sent to England to organize a British edition of *Yank*. With two enlisted men, I made arrangements for printing and distribution, got a statement and a picture from Churchill for the cover, and we waited for the negatives of the great issue. When they came, they were all about the Marines—a special edition dedicated to the Marines, and there was not a Marine in England! Can you imagine the reception that first issue would have had from a bunch of doughboys! Well, having no sense of how to keep out of trouble, we worked straight through forty-eight hours and wrote a complete new issue which was received with great acclaim by the Army in England and by the British press. However, I was severely scolded by cable for “unauthorized alterations in the material supplied by *Yank* Headquarters.”

November 1942 was coming up; every newspaperman in London sensed that a big operation also was coming up. I was told that if *Yank* had a correspondent it wished to send with a small party of newspapermen to cover something big to have him ready. The only man I could send was Sergeant Neville who was in London on a temporary assignment with orders to return to the United States. I cabled my superiors in Washington in the most guarded terms asking permission to use Neville on an assignment of the greatest importance. Naturally impossible, I said, to give details, but it's *Yank's* great opportunity. Back came a message saying, “. . . impossible to grant authorization requested without full detail.” So, we missed *Yank's* opportunity to cover the landings in North Africa. When the invasion news broke, I was permitted to send Neville and to go myself. After I got to Africa and started the *Stars and Stripes*, I was transferred to General Eisenhower's staff, and the paper was operated as a special-staff section, instead of as a branch of the Information and Education section as were the army newspapers

in other Theaters. Personally, I think this freedom from the Information and Education Division's staff control was one of the reasons why the *Stars and Stripes Mediterranean* quickly became the most quoted army paper, why it was able to build up the most professional staff, and to enjoy, what the late Fred Painton of *Reader's Digest* called, "the finest morale of any outfit I have seen in the army in either war."

The July 1944 "purge" of the *Stars and Stripes Mediterranean* eliminated the home subscriptions, the magazine supplements, the possibility of adequate and free coverage of the political campaign, and the possibility of improved home-news coverage through the facilities of the wire services. It eliminated me. Secretary Stimson and Director of Public Relations, Major General Surles, were in Italy in July 1944, and the Theater Commander was requested to relieve me.

When the Chief of Staff told me in Algiers (the Theater Commander was in Italy) he said he had no idea why I had been relieved, that he thought we had a good paper, and that I had done a good job. The Chief of Staff said the only thing that even sounded like a reason was that General Surles had said, "White isn't content to run an army newspaper. He wants to publish a second *New York Times*."

The critical editorial comment in the United States was widespread. The result of the purge, far from hurting the *Stars and Stripes*, strengthened its position, and it has gone on to be a better paper than it had been, thanks to the efforts of its fine staff and the cooperation of the Theater command. After the election, it was permitted to buy the wire services we had wanted so long.

In the First World War the *Stars and Stripes* established high standards and noble traditions of honest, competent, and worthwhile army journalism. The able and devoted men who have worked on the *Stars and Stripes* in this war have endeavored to live up to the standards and to carry forward these traditions.

Colonel Egbert White has returned to his prewar position as vice-president of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn, New York advertising agency.

THE MYTH OF FREEDOM OF PRESS

Durward Pruden

America does *not* have freedom of press! This may seem to be a shocking statement but it is, unfortunately, all too true. And the most shocking thing about it is that freedom of press has not been destroyed by that favorite whipping boy—the government—but by technological advancements that have made it impossible for the press to be owned by any but a small clique of extremely wealthy publisher-industrialists, most of whom hold identical, conservative viewpoints about all the controversial problems facing western civilization. Monopoly over the production of a commodity is unjust to the consumer; but monopoly, or semimonopoly, over the public-opinions industry endangers the very lifeblood of democracy itself.

If, some generations ago when the art of printing was in its infancy, a man could have bought a simple wood-frame printing press, a set of type, and a bundle of paper for—say, twenty-five dollars, it might be said that freedom of press existed then in whatever proportion the men who wanted to express themselves could afford to put twenty-five dollars into such expression. But the difficulty in those days was that real democratic government had hardly yet been born, and men who were able financially to express their opinions in print were prevented from doing so by tyrannical governments. The centuries rolled slowly by and courageous men at last created democratic government in some parts of both the Old World and the New. Now men were at last free to express any ideas they chose—real freedom of press could now come to pass! But another change had also been taking place during those centuries in which democratic government was developing. The inexpensive, simple press was undergoing the most amazing technological improvements. It became a mammoth machine capable of turning out huge newspapers almost faster than the eye could see them, and costing many thousands of dollars. Its great productive power had to be supported by many other intricate and costly

machines of the graphic arts, and the whole manned by a large, specialized, and costly personnel, housed in a large and costly plant, and—in cities—sitting on a very costly piece of real estate. Truly, the newspaper had become Big Business in every sense of the term, and its owners had, for the most part, ceased to be professional newspapermen and had become great industrial financiers under tremendous pressure toward economic conservatism. Editors had been reduced to positions somewhat similar to foremen of the plants. And so it is now found that these owners of large individual newspapers and the great newspaper chains—veritable empires of public-opinion formation—possess almost exactly the same attitude toward labor, wages, social security, stability of investments, taxation, and distribution of national income as do the wealthy owners of steel plants, oil wells, banks, and other large-scale businesses. That is why the nation has been faced during the last decade or so with a press that has been largely on the wrong side of almost every social, political, and economic question that has arisen.

Even when an occasional publisher's sense of fair play has raised him above a position of narrow class struggle to a genuine desire to make his paper contribute constructively to the solving of man's overwhelming problems, that publisher has been faced with almost unsurmountable odds in the censorship of great advertisers—or worse yet, great advertising agencies strategically placing huge blocks of advertising for many conservative clients. He has had to fight against tremendous financial pressures of many kinds, and, until a recent Supreme Court decision, could have been refused the service of the large international news-gathering agencies without which a single paper could hardly operate. This destruction of free enterprise as well as free press in the newspaper business has gone much farther than the semimonopolistic control of financing, advertising, and news wire service; it extends into syndicated features and even into the use of the most popular children's comic strips.

A few outstanding examples, chosen at random from among

hundreds being poured out every day, will serve to point out how the bulk of the nation's press has—either by design or by a community of economic interests—become the publicity front for the most reactionary business interests. Going back a few years the reader will probably remember the manner in which the newspapers pilloried President Roosevelt's first New Deal appointee to the then conservative Supreme Court—Justice Hugo Black—as a bigoted, intolerant, anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, anti-Catholic, Ku Kluxer. This titanic propaganda crucifixion came in the midst of the great economic struggle in the last depression when "the people" were trying to bring a small degree of public responsibility to their jungle-like economy that had completely broken down. The people's will had been clearly expressed in the overwhelming victories for the President in both the election of 1932 and the one of 1936. But the powerful vested-interest minority of the nation was determined that the people's will, as expressed in free democratic elections, should not be carried out. The press went right ahead as if the elections did not count and as if Mr. Hoover and Mr. Landon had won the elections—Mr. Roosevelt's occupancy of the White House notwithstanding. The fight centered in the Supreme Court, tightly packed with lawyers of the Harding, Coolidge, Hoover philosophy of *laissez faire*. When the President finally managed to get a liberal on the Court, the great reactionary propaganda machine of those vested interests wheeled into action and for weeks—months—poured upon the head of mild-mannered, scholarly Mr. Black the most amazing avalanche of utterly false vituperation that the world had ever seen. Most of the papers entirely suppressed the well-known or easily ascertainable fact that Hugo Black had spent a major portion of his life fighting for the rights of minority groups, especially Negroes, Jews, and Catholics, and that he had done probably more than any man in his native Alabama to defeat both the Klan and the economic conditions that had created it. These papers likewise carefully concealed their real dislike of Hugo

Black—the fact that for eleven years in the United States Senate he had fought without quarter the economic aristocracy that had created the depression and had ground down the common man into abject misery and poverty. They concealed the fact that he had fought *against* monopolies, holding companies, high tariffs, subsidies for rich shipping companies, and all forms of corporate free-booting; and that he had fought *for* the rights of the little people everywhere who did not have the money to come to Washington to speak for themselves. Suppressing all these things, the press poured trumped-up charges of bigotry into every part of the newspapers. Gone was any semblance of the old ethical idea of confining propaganda and opinion to the editorial page. The denunciations screamed out from alleged news columns, headlines, cartoons, syndicated articles—from every part of the papers. For about two months most of the nations newspapers devoted themselves almost exclusively to this political rabble-rousing under the righteous cloak of concern about bigotry on the Supreme Court. But careful analysis of their output showed that their concern was in direct proportion to their hatred of the New Deal. With utter disregard to possible social consequences, the press deliberately and relentlessly used a highly emotionalized and dangerous, but completely illogical, fear of racial and religious intolerance to accomplish an economic end. And unfortunately, the public, not being able to check on the things which the press withheld, was somewhat taken in by this propaganda campaign. If the unethical trick had worked, the country would have been deprived of the one Justice of the present Court whom the law profession agrees is destined to go down in history as a combination Holmes and Brandeis—one of the greatest judges in the long life of the Court.

Most fair-minded people—even those of mildly conservative viewpoint—must recognize how the press has devoted a great portion of its activity for the last ten years to besmirching the late President Roosevelt in an attempt to discredit the principles for

which he stood and the reforms that he pushed through. Using every device of the propaganda, publicity, and advertising arts, the papers continually castigated the President, his wife, his children, and even his little dog, Fala! Perhaps by raging against Elliot Roosevelt's quite commonplace business adventures, they could somehow convince the public that social security was wrong. By painting the gracious and intellectual Mrs. Roosevelt as a restless gadfly and busybody, perhaps they could somehow show that wages-and-hours legislation was indecent. By constant publicity and by leaving the unstated but sinister suggestion that maybe the President himself connived with the Japanese to bomb Pearl Harbor, perhaps they could somehow discredit his theories as to high income taxes on the upper brackets and surplus profit taxes on corporations.

If any other proof is needed that the press has largely become merely the publicity front for the conservative economic interests of the country, one only has to think over the raw deal that has been given labor in wartime publicity. Blithely attributing the most amazing industrial production the world has ever known to the genius of management, the press usually ignored the fifty-odd million faithful workers and scoured the nation each day searching for a handful of workers off the job somewhere. Day by day the papers and hourly radio newscasts ground out thousands of words about some possible strike that might possibly occur, or about a possible strike that had been expected but did not occur, or a widely publicized small strike that actually did occur, or one that just ended. There was always ample publicity against labor. Even the slightest labor trouble anywhere—or often as not, management trouble pictured as labor trouble—was publicized as causing scarcity, even death, to the boys at the front. The term "labor front" with its implications of uncertain loyalty was coined and placed in the newspapers' jargon. Never was there any mention of a "management front." Unfortunately, this Hitlerian propaganda

technique of constant repetition was partially successful, because many civilians and many servicemen have been indoctrinated into a very bad distaste of anything even remotely verging on labor problems.

What is the significance of all this to the future? Despite the end of the war the world is still in serious trouble; democracy is at the crossroad. Winning the war does not automatically stamp out the economic chaos that produced fascism and war. Even in this closing age of steam and gasoline, man's problems have become almost too complicated for him to understand and solve. In the coming atomic age it will be utterly impossible for the average voting citizen to understand all the complicated problems which, in a democracy, he must vote upon. His only possible hope of making an intelligent decision on these intricate and controversial questions is to hear *both* sides, and in something like a fifty-fifty proportion. The conservative viewpoint is entitled, in a free society, to a presentation, but not to an almost exclusive presentation.

If in the last half of the eighteenth century, British Tories in America had possessed the technological devices for mass dissemination of propaganda now offered by the press, America could never have won her freedom, because the average American Colonial citizen would have been indoctrinated to believe that Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry were wild-eyed radicals, that Benjamin Franklin was some sort of a "boondoggler," and that George Washington was a dangerous communist—that mystic "devil-word" which for twenty years has been used by demagogues the world over to paralyze the democracies into inaction against fascist aggression.

In the England of Churchill and Atlee it has taken the ghastly specter of modern war, rocket bombs, and murdered children to awaken at last the common people and to convince them overwhelmingly that the old world of Lord Beaverbrook's journalism was not as fine as his newspapers pictured it, but needed some drastic reform-

ing. America has *only partially* escaped the deadening effect of this cultural lag of its press. In the dismal days of the depression Americans were able, by means of the radio, to listen directly to the clarion voice of Franklin Roosevelt and thus largely discount the distorted and carefully edited accounts they read in their papers the next day. So the people continued in election after election and, against all precedents, to give Roosevelt the mandate to lead them onward toward a better world. But there was also a disadvantageous aspect to this ease with which a great leader could go directly to his people. Only the prestige of the President's office and the personality of a Roosevelt could command this almost universal audience and thus override the veto power of the press. This is where the Congress enters the picture. If the average little congressman announced that he was going directly to his constituents with a "fire-side chat" on a certain night, nobody much bothered to listen. So the congressman had to "play ball" with the conservative publicity moguls and their reactionary backers. The result: a highly dynamic liberalism of the people expressed in the repeated election of a liberal president but continually thwarted by a conservative congress. This is a dangerous situation. When a long-suffering people keep voting for a progressive president but continue to find their problems unsolved because his hands are tied, they may eventually lose confidence in the whole democratic process. It is then that revolution—either from the left or the right—might actually occur; when a powerful, wealthy minority owning the propaganda machine can successfully nullify the elections and paralyze democracy into a static inaction.

Well—what can be done about the press beating its fists against the realities of the time and carrying a great number of its readers along with it by cajoling them with a little real news and a great deal of entertainment with the confusing propaganda sandwiched in between? Frankly, the economics of the situation is depressing. There is no profit in presenting the liberal viewpoint—and ideals

will not pay rent nor buy food. Despite the fact that a very small minority of newspaper and magazine publishers try courageously to give the other side, it nevertheless remains a cold, hard, economic fact that once a man becomes wealthy enough to own a great publishing concern, he usually plays the economic game to the limit by thumping for what is to his own economic advantage, regardless of social consequences. And he can afford to buy the very best writing, cartooning, and publicity talent for his purpose.

Let it first be made clear that no real believer in democracy would for one minute sanction the suppression of the conservative viewpoint. Freedom of speech and press must apply equally to all, and especially to those with whom one violently disagrees—else it is not freedom at all. But that which now masquerades as freedom of press is freedom in theory only. It is merely freedom from *governmental* intervention. In practice it amounts only to freedom for the wealthy owners of the press to propagandize their viewpoint. And, as stated above, they practically all have the same viewpoint—the conservative, even reactionary, viewpoint. They, in turn, must not be allowed, while making a great noise about freedom of press, to destroy that freedom by denying opinions they oppose the right to a fair hearing. The problem is not to destroy the conservative viewpoint but to offset it by a proportionate presentation of the liberal side. And this equality should apply to the most radical viewpoint even as it applies to the most reactionary viewpoint. Somewhere in between, the average citizen can be trusted to make an intelligent decision if he can only hear both sides. That is the very essence of long accepted legal equality as exemplified in trial by jury before opposing counsel. The great danger to civilization is—and always has been—not that false doctrines would replace established truth, but rather that entrenched error may perpetuate itself by suppressing truth.

A number of suggestions have been made for remedying the present unfair and dangerous situation: Some students of the

problem hope that labor unions will become wealthy enough to establish big metropolitan dailies throughout the country with all the customary newspaper paraphernalia to intrigue the public—sports, comics, fashions, cooking, advice to the lovelorn, etc.—but offering an opposite type of propaganda. Some believe that more “socially conscious” wealth can be enticed into the newspaper field on something like a hobby basis to offer more papers like the two recently established by Marshall Field. Others believe that the public may have to subsidize newspapers in somewhat the same way as municipal radio stations are now operated, with ironclad regulations ensuring the presentation of both sides of controversial questions and separating news from political propaganda. It has been suggested that cooperative newspapers—owned by their readers—might be established, something like the existing cooperative cafeterias and grocery stores. Some believe that giving the newspaper industry a good dose of Sherman Antitrust prosecution and breaking up the big chain newspaper organizations might help, and might reduce a few of the most blatant and most vicious voices in America to a less obstructionist role. The Supreme Court recently ruled that insurance was interstate commerce and therefore subject to the antitrust laws; has not the newspaper business become interstate commerce?

Society may decide that a steady flow of truthful, unbiased news is as vital to the democratic process as is the steady flow of pure water, or of electricity, to comfortable living and thus turn the press into a public utility with bipartisan public-service commissions in each State to regulate it and to ensure an equal presentation of both sides of all questions, as well as the separating of news from editorial opinion.

Stronger libel laws covering the press might force it to a finer regard for the truth and to a less frequent use of the propaganda devices of name calling, transfer, card stacking, suggestion, etc.

It may be that none of these suggestions will be the final solution,

but surely the working, professional newspapermen (as distinguished from the publisher-owners), together with enlightened statesmanship, can work out some plan whereby the public can get something like a fifty-fifty discussion of controversial issues upon which to base its opinions. Meanwhile, since the average student is probably (and the average adult is certainly) more influenced on vital problems by the daily press than by the subject matter of his schoolroom classes, it becomes a solemn responsibility of classroom teachers to try to help their students to learn to arrive at the truth in spite of the press—or at least to withhold judgement until the truth is available. While this writer does not believe it either possible or desirable for the teacher, who should be one of the best-informed people in his community, to maintain a coldly objective attitude toward the causes of war, disease, poverty, and human misery, still it is possible, without necessarily taking sides, for the teacher to show students how the current conservative newspaper headings could have been given exactly the opposite propaganda slant, and then to show how the material could have been presented objectively. He can also call attention to the political significance of the publicity given certain items, and the omission of others.

In conclusion, the press, as it now functions, is a very dangerous bottleneck in the democratic process, and the future of enlightened, progressive democracy may well depend on the teacher's doing his duty in this vital area—and doing it courageously without regard to reactionary efforts to label him as a communist, Red, Pink, fellow-traveler, or any of the other present-day rash of "buga-boo" terms. Tryanny over man's body deprives him of his freedom, but tryanny over his mind and emotions robs him of his very soul!

Durward Pruden is an Instructor in Education at New York University. His doctoral thesis was on "The Opposition of the Press to the Ascension of Hugo Black to the Supreme Court of the United States."

"AND NOW NOTHING WILL BE RESTRAINED FROM THEM"

John Boylan

And the whole earth was one language and one speech. . . . And they said go to let us build us a city, and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. . . . And the Lord said, Behold the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do; and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do. . . . Let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech. So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth; and they left off to build the city. Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the Lord did therefore confound the language of all the earth; and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of the earth.

Genesis, Chapter 11

So, according to the Bible, that is what happened to one group of people, who encompassed all of the earth they knew, spoke one language, and had above all freedom of speech in their free world.

They undertook to build a tower to heaven.

In the trial of war criminals at Nuernberg, there was a close approach to free speech. Each criminal was given a receiver, by which he could listen to any one of four languages, so he might understand why the peoples of the world demand justice.

All were able to understand. Or were they? Words mean nothing in themselves. The criminals suppressed free speech in an effort to enslave the world. Among their judges were men whose nations have and do suppress free speech in a world they say has been made free by the slaughter of many people.

Most self-righteous among the judges of the criminals were men from the United States of America. Equally so were men from Great Britain. Perhaps more cynical were the men from Russia and France.

The war criminals were brought to trial in a holier-than-thou atmosphere. Ruthless and criminal they were, but they might have been justified in doubting the sanctity of the court before which they were summoned. They might have had grave doubts about the sincerity of the nations that judged them.

The criminals were judged and condemned for crimes against humanity. Their oblivion was to pave the way for a great new world in which men would freely exchange ideas and grow to understand one another. Their exit from the world would make possible an approach to a world government wherein "the whole earth was one language and one speech." It was this ideal their judges propounded as a justification for war.

It is a noble ideal. It is one inevitable if future generations are to endure. Millions throughout the whole of the earth pray fervently that it may be achieved. It is to be hoped that it can be. But the record of the self-righteous victors gives no indication that free speech in a free world is a final solution.

No press in the world was freer during the war years than the British and the American. True, they subscribed to war regulations. It is a fact that the American people were more fully informed about the vast action of war in all theaters than any other people. Was this free speech in a free world? Is this the ideal we seek to export to all other nations?

Other nations have their doubts. They look askance at our version of free speech. To people of other nations, free speech in America is a commercial commodity, closely controlled, and extraordinarily profitable for the proprietors of news services, newspapers, radio stations, and newsreel organizations. There is more than a tinge of envy in the disparagement of American free speech heard so frequently in other countries.

The rivalry during the war of Tass, the state-controlled Russian news agency, and Reuters, the semiofficial but privately owned British news agency, and America's privately owned Associated

Press, United Press, International News, and other services created Homeric laughter in a world asked to regard free speech as something like free air.

Speech was not free. It was one of the most valuable commodities in a war economy. Throughout the world anxious people at home waited in suspense for word from the various fields of battle.

When the late President Roosevelt met Prime Minister Churchill at Casablanca, the news was first released by the British in London. American and Russian news agencies frothed. When the Big Three met at Teheran, Tass was the first to tell the world. This time the Anglo-Americans raged.

But, when Roosevelt and Churchill moved on to Cairo to talk with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, Reuters was prepared. The news was made public in this instance by one of the many nebulous "diplomats" supposed to infest Lisbon. The reaction of the Russians is unknown, but grave representations were made by the chagrined American press services.

These major incidents could be multiplied many times as less important freedom of speech was fought over by the conflicting agencies eager and anxious to be first during the war.

However, the American press had its day. It was the first to announce the invasion of Normandy, one of the most coveted stories of the entire war. And it was the first to announce the capitulation of the Nazis. In these major stories both the Russians and the British took a back seat. All Europe laughed.

A British lawyer walking in the blackout on his way to the Temple to do night fire-watch duty during the V-2 bombardment of London, unable to see the American to whom he was talking, said undoubtedly the premature release in America of the imminent invasion of Normandy was an accident. He could understand, he said wryly, how an apprentice girl teletype operator would innocently use a confidential release on the invasion to test her communications machine. He said she probably had never learned the

one about "The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog," and anyway how did she know that the teletype, on which she practised, was in instant communication with Associated Press headquarters in New York City. An unfortunate incident the British lawyer commented because it gave the Nazis more than sufficient notice of the imminence of the attack, which really came twenty-four hours later.

When the Germans surrendered, the Associated Press reporter apparently had no teletype operator. He did have a telephone. Deliberately he ignored the confidential control over the information he had been given and announced it to the world by the way of New York. This time his own American colleagues were the most outraged. They had been scooped because they observed the "off the record" information known to all of them. Russians and British threw no stones.

The confusion caused in America and elsewhere by this premature release is indescribable. There is little reason to believe it endangered allied lives in Europe. But, it sent Americans on a spree which sobered suddenly as hour after hour passed without official confirmation. It practically closed down war plants under pressure for the delivery of materials urgently needed for the then contemplated invasion of Japan. When official word did come it was received by many Americans as an aspirin offered to cure an outrageous hangover.

What happened to the Associated Press reporter, who is said to have been fired, is as unimportant as what may have happened to the little British teletype writer who practised on her machine with the most carefully guarded secret then extant in the world.

This is the free speech in a free world offered to other nations as an American ideal. It probably served to create as much rivalry and as much diplomatic friction as any other factor during World War II.

The peoples of the world regretfully seem to conclude they are not yet ready for a repetition of the days when "the whole world

was one language and one speech." They are not ready to attempt a tower to heaven again. They dread the reverse—the bringing of creative power from the heavens to the earth in the form of the atomic bomb. Free speech in the atomic age would be a highly explosive commodity under the present system.

Many minds are working to bring about free speech—really free speech in a really free world. If sometimes the goal seems impossible, an excerpt from Arthur O'Shaughnessy's ode offers solace.

Sang O'Shaughnessy long before teletypes or telephones were imagined:

We, in the ages lying
In the buried past of the earth,
Built Nineveh with our sighing,
And Babel itself in our mirth;
And o'erthrew them with prophesying
To the old of the new world's worth;
For each age is a dream that is dying,
Or one that is coming to birth.

John Boylan, veteran newspaperman and foreign correspondent, was a boatswain's mate in charge of an LSVP in the first invasion waves at Casablanca, Gela, Salerno, and Omaha Beach.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The article by Morris L. Ernst first appeared in *Harper's Magazine*, July 1945, and is reprinted with permission. The paper by William Benton was presented at the New York Herald Tribune Forum.

THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE MAINE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SINCE 1941, THE BEGINNING OF THE WAR

E. George Payne

The readers of the JOURNAL will be interested as I am in the accomplishments of the State of Maine since the beginning of World War II. The following list shows definite progress toward the development of a conventional school program and as such has great merit, but still falls far short of an essential program of education for the postwar world. For instance, the salary of an elementary-school teacher (minimum) is one thousand dollars per year. This is about half of the average wage of a day laborer, and is a little better than would be paid for domestic service. With such help in the schools the essential task of education cannot be performed.

Again, this is no criticism of the State of Maine and its fine accomplishment; for here again Maine stands among the top half of the States of the Union. The situation here indicates how far we shall have to go if education in free America is to serve democracy. This condition should serve to spur educators to increased efforts if they hope to do more than a conventional job.

1. Established position of Director of Elementary Education, thereby making the work of the rural supervisors available for the entire elementary field and not simply the rural areas.

2. Established regional conferences for the purpose of expediting Federal and State directives and unifying the administration of the State school program.

3. Appointed a Supervisor of War Activities

In charge of:

- a) Defense transportation regulations on school conveyances
- b) Lanham Act provisions on housing, maintenance, and operation of schools in War Impact Areas
- c) Rationing
 - (1) Sugar

- (2) Gas
- (3) Foods
- (4) Fuel Oil

d) Salvage

- (1) Paper
- (2) Metal

4. Nursery schools. Surveyed the need and appointed a director of this service. Established schools in war areas and a program for the day care of children of working mothers.

5. Established program of Occupational Information and promoted the guidance program already established.

6. Established a Division of Finance and Control and appointed a Director of this service.

7. Set machinery in motion for the reorganization of the State Elementary School Curriculum.

8. Raised requirements for State Certificate of Superintendence Grade, ensuring higher standards for professional supervision.

9. To meet teacher-shortage emergency established Teaching Permits good for the duration only, nontransferable within or without the system for which they are issued, thus safeguarding the professional standards for teachers.

10. Set up a program for Cadet Teaching of students in training in the State Normal Schools, permitting student teachers to train in a school of their own instead of in the Campus Laboratory Schools, under the direction of a Traveling Critic Teacher and Supervisor of Training who is charged with the supervision of not exceeding 5 such student teachers, giving each one day per week for a period of an entire semester. The work done in this manner is accepted toward fulfillment of requirements of a normal-school diploma or a degree.

11. Established a High School Equivalency Board to pass on the record of high-school students called into the service before graduation from high school and who deserve special consideration toward meeting requirements for graduation and a high-school diploma.

12. Surveyed the school-consolidation possibilities of the State and the closing of nonessential schools.

13. Postwar planning for more adequate housing facilities for schools of Maine.

14. Increased, through legislation, the subsidy from \$100 to \$190 for each teaching position.
15. Teachers' Retirement Law amended, and restored to this system \$949,000 of State funds to match members' contributions, thus making the system actuarially sound.
16. Sponsored legislation which provided an addition of half a million dollars to the existing Equalization Fund.
17. Sponsored a summer session for persons engaged in manual training to improve the quality of instruction in this area made necessary by the heavy drain of trained and skilled instructors entering war industries.
18. Established four (4) additional field offices and field workers for Vocational Rehabilitation.
19. Establishment of summer Workshop for Elementary Teachers.
20. Established canning centers, physical fitness, health, and recreation programs.
21. Reorganization of the State Department of Education with a Deputy Commissioner in Charge of Planning and Research; a Deputy Commissioner of Education in Charge of Curriculum; a Deputy Commissioner in Charge of Teacher Preparation, Certification and Placement; a Deputy Commissioner in Charge of Vocational Education, and a Director of Finance.
22. Proposed legislation changing the two Normal Schools, which offer four years of post-high-school training and a degree, to teachers' colleges.
23. More definite planning with college presidents on the preparation of teachers to teach in the secondary-school area.
24. The improvement of housing facilities of the present office staff.
25. Improvement of the school code and necessary changes in the school law.
26. The closing of one Normal School and the temporary suspension of another, thus effecting a substantial saving of State money without impairing the efficiency of the teacher-training program.
27. The consolidation of several school unions, thus reducing the overall cost of supervision for the State.
28. The adjustment of contracts with municipalities in which teacher-training programs are being maintained for the use of the elementary-school facilities for practice-teaching purposes, by which municipalities, where such schools are located, bear a more equitable proportion of the cost of training the school children.

29. Establishment of a \$1,000 minimum salary for all teachers in the State.

30. Increase in State appropriations to towns and cities of nearly \$1,000,000 annually, to help towns bear the increased cost of education.

BOOK REVIEWS

What To Do With Germany, by LOUIS NIZER. New York: Readers Book Service, 1944.

Mr. Nizer's book has received such unanimous approval that it is with some reluctance that this reviewer ventures to express a somewhat different opinion. There is no doubt that Mr. Nizer has given the question a great amount of careful study and not a little original thought. For both of which he is to be commended particularly at a time when so much that is said on the subject of Germany is colored completely by emotionalism. But the mere absence of emotion does not necessarily of itself denote the presence of sound reason.

In his first five chapters, he discusses the German role in recent and past world history. His enumeration of the facts is preceded by an analysis and dismissal of what he feels are the unworkable extremist proposals of dealing with Germany. He proposes what he terms neither cruelty nor sentimentality, but justice. From there he proceeds to list and discuss the extent of Germany's crimes against the world. The disgraceful farce of the war criminal trials after World War I is lucidly presented and the legal as well as moral basis for immediate and all-inclusive judicial action is carefully cited. In this he stands with Dr. Sheldon Glueck and others who would not allow for evasion by the criminal, no hiding behind special privilege, archaic precedent, or "superior orders."

The discussion of German economics and finances, however to this reviewer's mind, contains the seeds of what seem to him the equivocation to be found in the latter part of the book. While deploring German methods from numerous outright frauds, to cartels, and subsidies of foreign markets, Mr. Nizer seems to think these would be permissible if under "international control." In view of Germany's record one is inclined to wonder. Further, while talking about destroying Germany's war-making potential, Mr. Nizer is like too many others concerned about Germany's economic health and full German stomachs. Apparently Ger-

many can be sound and content only if she is in a dominant position. The rest of the world will not be safe with a discontented Germany. To our misfortune the rest of the world knows just how safe we are if Germany is strong, and by her own standards contented. It is here that the student of German affairs begins to recognize the old familiar line. In view of the enthusiasm with which this book has been received, this is downright alarming. And this line is subsequently followed until it comes out openly in the final two chapters of the book which deal with the necessity for world organization.

Few people will argue with the necessity for such action. But to predicate punishment and control of Germany on the creation of a new society is somewhat like refusing to jail a housebreaker because the man he robbed wasn't a really nice person himself. Only the most foggy-minded individual proposes to allow murderers to go free because all of us have had murder in our hearts at some time in our lives. The fact remains that certain controls operated in most of us to prevent murder which were nonoperative in the murderer. Whatever the pressures were upon such a person, society feels it has the right to protect itself from repetition of such acts. Psychiatrists, sociologists, social workers, all recognize the need for restraint of certain personalities. While working for accomplishment of reforms of our society which might prevent future generations from including these types, they admit the necessity for stringent dealing in the present, even though the individual criminal may truly be termed society's victim. And certainly none would try to shape future institutions to meet the desires and yearnings of today's miscreants.

Yet Mr. Nizer quite seriously ties together effective long-time control of Germany with the creation of a world state, implying that if the latter is not done we are preparing for a third World War, which will be of our own choosing. It is unfortunate that Mr. Nizer saw fit to treat two major themes in one short volume. Some of his suggestions for the re-education of Germany are valid and interesting. His discussion of Germany's will to war, the facts he has mustered to indict Germany as the criminal she has historically been, and other points in the book, are extremely interesting and valuable. But to many who have no illusions about Germany, past, present or future, the total program may seem singularly gentle for the perpetrators of Rotterdam, Lidice, Dachau, and Buchenwald. There are times when one cannot help feeling that it is fortunate that Germany's future will be determined not alone by the Mr. Nizers of this world but by Russians, Czechs, Dutch, Norwegians, and French as well.

The Real Soviet Russia, by DAVID J. DALLIN. Translated by JOSEPH SHAPLEN. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944, 260 pages.

Despite great protestations of objectivity and despite its appearance under the aegis of a university press, this book is, nonetheless, a part of the present avalanche of anti-Russian propaganda. It undoubtedly contains much that is true about Russia—both good and bad, but the author's violent anti-Soviet bias and his hatred of Stalin are so obvious throughout the book as to cast doubt on its value as a factual report. For example, Mr. Dallin attempts to explain that the cruelty of the Germans during World War II toward captured Russian civilians and soldiers was not the result of Nazi bestiality or Hitlerian madness, but rather was caused in some strange fashion, believe it or not, by Stalin!

The Jehovah's Witnesses, by HERBERT HEWITT STROUP. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945, 180 pages.

Mr. Stroup's book is another one of those illuminating and detailed studies of a social organization that adds to our greater understanding of the currents of American culture. Through the use of the historical approach as well as that of participant observer, Mr. Stroup has been able to trace the origin and background of the movement and to show the effects of the movement on the witnesses themselves. The people here described could not easily be understood, without a knowledge of the movement which so channeled their lives. For this reason the book will be of value to all students of human behavior and especially to sociologists, psychologists, teachers, and ministers. To all interested in the deeper and underlying significance of democracy, freedom, and civil liberties this book is highly recommended.

City Development, by LEWIS MUMFORD. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1945, 243 pages.

City Development is a stimulating collection of essays by one of the great figures in the field of city planning. Mumford includes studies in disintegration and renewal of the city and discusses the metropolitan milieu, mass production, and housing and the social foundations of post-war building. He includes special chapters on Honolulu and the plan of London. None of these essays are now available in print, except the last two which have been published in England.

Mumford is a life-long exponent of regionalism, regional planning, and garden cities, and this book represents the development of his thinking between the years 1922 and 1945. The essays set forth, the further development of the views, and policies originally described in his *The Culture of Cities*. Especially interesting is his critical discussion of the future of the London plan as a result of the war.

Practical Applications of Democracy, by GEORGE B. DE HUSZAR.
Harper and Brothers, 1945, 140 pages.

This is a simple, concise, effective statement. It deals with the nature of the democratic method—to secure wide participation through problem-centered groups of appropriate size. The applications given by the author are in the fields of community, government, education, art, leisure, journalism, employment, vocational training, and industry. Preceding Part II, on Application of the Method, the author in Part I poses the problem of disintegration and inaction caused by the size and confusions of our institutions and problems. In his final section, Part III, he discusses the wholesome effects upon the individual of unity without uniformity secured through participating in group thinking and action such as he describes. Here, he also emphasizes the goal of democracy—the freeing of creative energy, and the opportunity for human development. He omits reference to much important work done in a few educational institutions, but his views are sound, his illustrations lively. The book is of an importance in greatly inverse ratio to its brief length.

Picture Stories from the Bible, Old Testament Edition, 1943, 232 pages.

Picture Stories from the Bible, Complete Life of Christ Edition, 1945, 96 pages.

Picture Stories from American History, Part I: The Period of Discovery and Exploration. New York: Educational Comics, Incorporated.

Increasingly, teachers and educators, aware of children's universal interest in comics, are becoming interested in the possibility of using comics as instructional material. During the summer of 1945, M. C. Gaines, who is the originator of the familiar comic book and who was

perhaps the largest publisher of comics, sold his comics publishing business and organized Educational Comics, Incorporated. Gaines, a superintendent of schools before he went into the publishing business, increasingly interested in the educational possibilities of comics is using Educational Comics, Incorporated, to publish frankly educational material in comic form. The New and Old Testament editions of *Picture Stories from the Bible* have already sold three million copies and are used as instructional materials in more than twenty-five hundred Sunday schools. *Picture Stories from American History*, Part I: The Period of Discovery and Exploration, is the first of a history series to appear in four parts. Educational Comics, Incorporated, has in preparation a series—Picture Stories from Science, as well as further series—Picture Stories from Natural History, Picture Stories from Mythology, and Picture Stories from Shakespeare. Teachers would do well to examine these materials as they are published. Those unfamiliar with the use of comics as a supplement to regular curricular materials will find it interesting to read the December 1944 issue of *THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY*, *The Comics as an Educational Medium*, particularly the article by W. W. D. Sones, "The Comics and Instructional Method."

Consumer Chemistry, by SARAH BENT RANSOM, JOHN CHIOCCA, and ROBERT VAN REEN. New Jersey: New Jersey State Teachers College, 1945, 36 pages.

This valuable teaching aid provides lists of sources of charts and maps, exhibits, films and film slides, publications, and recordings which are available at a small charge or without cost to teachers.

Sources are grouped into thirteen chapters relating to the consumer-education aspects of the general introductory course in chemistry. This publication will, in the opinion of this reviewer, be welcomed with much enthusiasm by the chemistry teachers who will emphasize the application of chemistry to modern living.

Guidance and Personnel Services in Education, by ANNA Y. REED. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1944, 483 pages.

Dr. Reed has written one of the most comprehensive textbooks on guidance and personnel services now available. From a lifetime of first-hand contact with the field, she has covered everything from the early

experiments in guidance to the latest attempts on evaluation of results. Included are excellent discussions of information on educational and occupational opportunities and community resources, information about the individual methods of utilizing informational data, organization, and administration.

Mission of the University, by JOSÉ ORTEGA Y GASSET. Translated with an introduction by HOWARD LEE NOSTRAND. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1944, 103 pages.

Ortega, teacher, essayist, publisher-editor, philosopher, and statesman, brings to his treatment of the mission of the university a far broader background of experience than do most persons who undertake to write on the subject of higher education. Ortega perhaps may be described fairly as a moderate or a conservative Spaniard who, before the Spanish revolution, saw the need for reform of both education and the State, and who worked ardently to bring about such reform. He felt that Spain's greatest fault was slovenliness. He was the great disciple of a tempered spirit of reform. Who can say that Spain would not be better off today if his advice had been heeded. Regarding education, Ortega feels that the modern university has gone overboard on the matter of professional education and research, and that it has virtually abandoned its greatest task, the teaching or transmission of culture. He agrees that society needs good professional men, and that the university should supply them, but he holds that even more than this, society needs to be assured that the capacity is developed for another kind of profession, the profession of governing. Ortega holds that the university's mission is to assert itself as a major spiritual power, higher than the press, "standing for serenity in the midst of frenzy, for seriousness and the grasp of intellect in the face of frivolity and unashamed stupidity."